

Legitimacy in Global Governance (LegGov)

Coding scheme for the study of GGI self-legitimation in Annual Reports, 1985-2017

A. Document selection and coding strategy

1. Report selection

The study focused on annual reports published by a subset of global governance institutions (GGIs) between 1985 and 2017. The following institutions were included:

- World Trade Organization (WTO);
- International Monetary Fund (IMF);
- Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN);
- World Bank (WB);
- Forest Stewardship Council (FSC);
- UN Security Council (UNSC);
- International Criminal Court (ICC);
- European Union (EU);
- African Union (AU); and
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

In cases in which these institutions published more than one report per year (such as biannual reports), the first report published each year was selected (for biannual reports, for example, the report concentrating on the reporting period from January to June).

In cases in which an institution published more than one type of report, the type of report selected was the type that:

- a) conformed to an established format published since 1985 or, where applicable, the creation of the institution; and
- b) focused most on explaining and representing the institution, rather than providing a more technical summary of functions, budgetary considerations and completed tasks.

2. Selection within individual reports

Within each annual report, only the sections that serve the function of introducing the report and/or the GGI itself were included in the analysis. These sections:

- are typically located at the beginning of the report;

- are comparatively brief;
- refer to the GGI as a whole as defined in the list of GGIs added above, instead of its organs or sub-organizations. (For example, these sections refer to the World Bank as a whole, instead of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)); and
- include introductory messages from representatives of the institution (such as the Chairperson or the President).

Conversely, the analysis did not include sections that

- form part of the main body or substantive part of the report;
- have specific issues, decisions or policy areas as its main focus; or
- discuss specific geographic regions in which the GGI conducted its activities.

For example, the IMF 2010 annual report contains a section introducing the IMF, a message from the Managing Director, and a first chapter that summarizes the report's main messages. In this case, all of these three sections were included in the analysis.

However, if no such introductory and/or overview section existed, or such a section was less than one page long, the first five pages of the report were coded instead (not counting tables of contents).

Decisions on which sections to include were not made for every sentence, but for each text section that followed a new heading. How exactly the sections are called within the report was irrelevant to the selection process. For example, potential subheadings of sections that were included in the analysis included "overview", "foreword," "preamble," "introduction," "Message from the President," but also "The World Bank Institutions." A decision of which parts of the report were included was made based on an assessment of whether the section served the function of introducing the report and/or providing an overview of key messages, instead of based on the name of the section. Consequently, the selected sections differed in length and comprised text subsumed under more than one subheading within the report.

3. Coding Unit

Codes were assigned to individual sentences. This entails that, even if two sentences focused on the same issue, a separate code was assigned to each sentence, as long as they both fell under the definition of this code. When deciding which code best captures a certain statement, the broader context in which this sentence was embedded was taken into account to discern the sentence's meaning. While in general codes did not exceed the limits of a single sentence, an

exception was made if the sentence contained a referent that refers to a noun included in the previous sentence, thus merging the justification contained within both sentences.

Example 1: “We’ve strengthened the relationship between FSC and our Global Network through structured partnership agreements and the establishment of a fully resourced Network Unit. These developments allow us to operate more effectively as an international organization, while addressing regional and national priorities with focused attention” (FSC, 2010: 2).

In this case, codes were added to both sentences at once, instead of separately, given that “these developments” is used as a referent to refer to, and justify, the institutional practices outlined in the previous sentence.

4. Assigning Codes

Codes were assigned to sentences that fit one of the 12 “legitimation practice” codes detailed below (see Section B). In addition, for each sentence that was assigned one of the 12 “legitimation practice” codes, the appropriate code for “agent of legitimation” was added to indicate which GGI engages in the legitimation practice. In other words, each coded sentence had two codes attached (one for “legitimation practice” and one for “agent of legitimation”).

In most cases, only one out of the 12 “legitimation practice” codes was assigned to one sentence. However, in some cases, a sentence referred to aspects that fell within the scope of more than one of the 12 “legitimation practice” codes. In such cases, this sentence was coded twice. Consequently, two “legitimation practices” codes were assigned to the sentence. Each of these instances, however, was collected in a separate Excel spreadsheet (called “double coding”) for a subsequent discussion with the other coders. In cases in which a coder was unclear on whether to assign one or two codes for “legitimation practices” to a sentence, the coder erred on the side of caution, added two codes and included the sentence into the shared Excel spreadsheet for further discussion. Overall, however, such cases were exceptional.

Example 2: “We are built upon the foundation that an informed, inclusive and democratic forum is where solutions are created” (FSC, 2010: 3).

This sentence describes a decision-making procedure (“forum ... where solutions are created”) that was evaluated with reference to three aspects, namely “informed,” “inclusive,” and “democratic.” While “inclusive” and “democratic” fell under the code “democratic procedure”, “informed” also indicated a decision-making procedure based on the best available knowledge/expertise

(“technocratic procedure”). Therefore, two codes for both “legitimation practices” were assigned to this sentence.

If a sentence contained a statement about the future **or** explicitly mentioned a policy, institutional arrangement and/or reform, it was always coded as a (democratic/technocratic) institutional practice **or** as a (democratic/technocratic) future-oriented statement respectively. In these cases, these sentences were not double-coded as either democratic or technocratic performance or procedure. However, if a sentence contained a statement about the future **and** explicitly mentioned a policy, institutional arrangement and/or reform, it was always be double-coded as both an institutional practice **and** as a future-oriented statement.

While the selection of sections was based on the requirement that they had to refer to the GGI as a whole (see Section 2), within these sections all legitimation statements were coded. For the ICC, for example, statements referring to the Office of the Prosecutor or the Presidency were included in addition to statements referring to the ICC as such.

5. Memos

Whenever appropriate, memos were used throughout the coding process to highlight sentences or sections of interest for in-depth qualitative case studies of the legitimation practices of specific GGIs. These memos served as reminders and inspiration for other qualitative case studies and **did not in themselves constitute part of the study’s coding.**

Of particular interest were sections that did not fulfil the requirements of any of the “legitimation practice” codes listed below, but that nevertheless captured

- a) broader discursive shifts;
- b) shifts in identity; and/or
- c) underlying substantive norms on which justifications are based.

Broader discursive shifts: If the annual reports are read chronologically (i.e., from the oldest to the newest documents), some of the memos highlighted when discursive changes start to take place. For example, it is well established that the global economic institutions began to speak in less technocratic ways in the 1990s. In this context, a memo flagged out in which Annual Report the shift from the Washington to the post-Washington consensus took place or became evident.

Shifts in identity: GGIs have presented themselves differently at different points in time. For example, in the 2000s the WB started to call itself a “Knowledge Bank”.

A memo was used to indicate when the WB commenced to use this or other self-descriptions.

Substantive norms: While our coding scheme was not designed to code all the possible norms used by GGIs (See Section B), memos were commonly used to indicate when a GGI spoke about human rights, sustainability, gender equality, etc. A memo, unlike a code, simply made a one-off annotation of when these norms commenced to appear or, alternatively, disappear.

B. Coding scheme

1. NORMATIVE JUSTIFICATIONS IN DISCURSIVE AND INSTITUTIONAL LEGITIMATION

1.1. Democracy

Statements that draw on democracy as a source of legitimacy indicate that the GGI is legitimate because “affected publics have due voice in and control over governance arrangements” (Tallberg and Scholte 2018: 9-10).

1.1.1. DEMO_PROC Democratic procedure

Definition: Statements indicating the way in which the GGI makes its decisions (as opposed to the GGI itself)/has made its decisions in a specific case is

- participatory/inclusive (with regard to its members, international or domestic actors outside of the GGI, or the general public more generally);
- based on deliberations;
- accountable; and/or
- transparent.

Note that these sentences therefore needed to explicitly refer to the GGI’s decision-making procedure.

A merely descriptive statement indicating that a GGI conducted consultations was not coded. Coded statements were only those that included a normative evaluation of such consultation as well. Merely descriptive statement were commonly highlighted with a memo.

Example 3: “The significance of this participatory structure and democratic approach is now evident in our shared achievements and growing success” (FSC, 2010: 3).

1.1.2. DEMO_PERF Democratic performance

Definition: Statements indicating that the results that the GGI produced further

- accountability by improving the level of answerability to domestic and/or international actors, and/or affected publics;
- participation/engagement in democratic discourses or processes (with regard to its members, international or domestic actors outside of the GGI, or the general public more generally); and/or

- respect for human dignity; human rights and enhancement of the common good.

For coded sentences highlighting participation/engagement, it was sufficient that a GGI argued that its actions resulted in increased awareness among the public of the GGI by providing information.

Example 4: “As a result, we see an even deeper commitment to FSC ® from market partners, stakeholders, and members and a momentum to keep working together to meet new challenges” (FSC, 2010: 2).

Example 5: “Example 2: “FSC certification is a mechanism to change the way that forests are managed to improve conditions for forest workers, respect the rights of indigenous peoples, protect biodiversity and strengthen socio-political frameworks” (FSC, 2010: 3).

1.1.3. DEMO_INST Institutional practice democracy

Definition: Statements indicating that an explicitly mentioned policy, institutional arrangement and/or reform has secured or enhanced the democratic character of the GGI’s procedure and/or performance.

Such a policy, institutional arrangement and/or reform included, among others,

- public hearings and outreach events, as long as they are newly institutionalized (i.e., occurring repeatedly and regularly after having been established);
- measures to broaden participation (allowing new non-member actors to take part in one or several phases of the GGI’s policy process, for example through consultations, policy coordination, or invitations to summits);
- reforms that alter the formal structure of GGI authority (such as changes in voting rights);
- announcements of cooperation initiatives or formal cooperation agreements with non-member actors;
- announcements of retrospective channels for answerability (such as performance reviews); and/or
- measures to increase the spread of information about the GGI,

as long as this policy, institutional arrangement and/or reform is justified as securing or enhancing the democratic character of the GGI’s procedure and/or performance.

Example 6: “Important reforms to the IMF’s transparency policy during FY2010 continued a decade-long progression toward greater openness about the Fund’s activities” (IMF, 2010: 14).

1.1.4. DEMO_FUTU Future-oriented statement democracy

Definition: Statements indicating that the GGI’s procedure and/or performance will be (more) democratic in the future because

- the way in which the GGI generally makes its decisions/has made its decisions in a specific case (as opposed to the GGI itself) is
 - participatory/inclusive (with regard to its members, international or domestic actors outside of the GGI, or the general public more generally);
 - based on deliberations;
 - accountable; and/or
 - transparent;
- or because the results that the GGI produced will further
 - accountability by improving the level of answerability to domestic and/or international actors; and/or affected publics;
 - participation/engagement in democratic discourses or processes (with regard to its members, international or domestic actors outside of the GGI, or the general public more generally); and/or
 - respect for human dignity; respect for human dignity; human rights and enhancement of the common good.

In addition to explicitly referring to a date or occurrence in the future, Future-oriented statements also included the expression of hopes, plans, or expectations about the future.

Indications of whether a statement is future-oriented were, among others,

- explicit references
 - to a specific date or year (e.g., March 2025) or
 - a general reference to the future (e.g., “as we look to the future”);
- the grammar of the sentence in question, specifically the use of
 - the simple future tense (e.g., “we will begin to work on”);
 - the future continuous (e.g., “we will be beginning to work on”);
 - the future perfect (e.g., “we will have begun to work on”);
 - the future perfect continuous (e.g., “we will have been beginning to work on”);
 - grammatical constructions with “going to” (e.g., “we are going to begin working on”);

- use of the subjunctive to refer to future events (e.g., “we hoped that we would be able to work on”).

Such statements also referred to decisions taken in the present and yielding gains in the future (“we continue to pursue this strategy, which will lead to x outcome”).

Example 7: “Finally, we need to forge ahead with quota and governance reforms, to give a greater voice to the dynamic emerging markets and developing countries that are becoming ever more important in the global economy” (IMF, 2010: 5).

1.2. Technocracy

Statements that draw on technocracy as a source of legitimacy indicate that the GGI is legitimate because it is “effective in the light of best available knowledge and policy instruments” (Tallberg and Scholte, 2018: 10).

1.2.1. TECH_PROC Technocratic procedure

Definition: Statements indicating that the way in which the GGI makes its decisions (as opposed to the GGI itself)/has made its decisions in a specific case is

- efficient (producing a high number of policy decisions in a short amount of time and/or at a low cost); and/or
- based on expertise (relying on the specialized and specialist/expert knowledge and skills).

These sentences therefore needed to explicitly refer to the GGI’s decision-making procedure.

In addition to explicit descriptions of a decision-making procedure as based on expert/specialized knowledge and skills, such a statement could also refer to specific forms of expertise (such as a legal procedure that is described as impartial or based on a thorough evaluation of evidence).

Example 8: “On the expenditure side, significant further progress was made towards achieving permanent reductions in expenditures and staff positions” (IMF, 2010: 14).

Example 9: “In 2010, we responded to market growth with focused research, increased engagement with market partners and improved services, standards and policies” (FSC, 2010: 2).

1.2.2. TECH_PERF Technocratic performance

Definition: Statements indicating that the results that the GGI produced are

- efficient (solving a large number of problems in a cost-efficient and timely way); and/or
- effective (addressing problems in a way that had a noticeable positive impact either domestically or internationally).

Such statements went beyond a descriptive reporting of results. Instead they contained a normative statement that evaluates this result as having a noticeable positive impact. Such a normative statement commonly had a direction that indicated a technocracy by producing efficient or effective results. This code therefore excluded statements that only had a positive evaluative statement (i.e., good, positive), without qualifying the normative direction of such an evaluative statement.

Example 10: “During the crisis, the IMF supported policy cooperation, striving to respond effectively to the serious challenges faced by our membership” (IMF, 2010: 4).

1.2.3. TECH_INST Institutional practice technocracy

Definition: Statements indicating that an explicitly mentioned policy, institutional arrangement and/or reform has secured or enhanced the technocratic character of the GGI’s procedure and/or performance.

Such a policy, institutional arrangement and/or reform may include, among others,

- public hearings and outreach events, as long as they are newly institutionalized (i.e., occurring repeatedly and regularly after having been established);
- measures to broaden participation (allowing new non-member actors to take part in one or several phases of the GGI’s policy process, for example through consultations, policy coordination, or invitations to summits);
- reforms that alter the formal structure of GGI authority (such as changes in voting rights);
- announcements of cooperation initiatives or formal cooperation agreements with non-member actors;
- announcements of retrospective channels for answerability (such as performance reviews); and/or
- measures to increase the spread of information about the GGI,

as long as this policy, institutional arrangement and/or reform is justified as securing or enhancing the technocratic character of the GGI's procedure and/or performance.

Example 11: “We’ve strengthened the relationship between FSC and our Global Network through structured partnership agreements and the establishment of a fully resourced Network Unit. These developments allow us to operate more effectively as an international organization, while addressing regional and national priorities with focused attention” (FSC, 2010: 2). [Note: In this case, codes were added to both sentences at once, instead of separately, given that “these developments” is used as a referent to refer to the institutional practices outlined in the previous sentence (see Section 3).]

Example 12: “Our commitment to continuous improvement is evident in revised trademark guidelines, improved labelling tools, streamlined pesticides derogation process, and the establishment of a Policy and Standards Committee” (FSC, 2010: 2).

1.2.4. TECH_FUTU Future-oriented statement technocracy

Definition: Statements indicating that the GGI's procedure and/or performance will be (more) technocratic in the future because

- the way in which the GGI generally makes its decisions (as opposed to the GGI itself)/has made its decisions in a specific case is
 - efficient (producing a high number of policy decisions in a short amount of time and/or at a low cost); and/or
 - based on expertise (relying on the specialized and specialist/expert knowledge and skills);
- or because the results that the GGI produced are
 - efficient (solving a large number of problems in a cost-efficient and timely way); and/or
 - effective (addressing problems in a way that had a noticeable positive impact either domestically or internationally).

In addition to explicitly referring to a date or occurrence in the future, Future-oriented statements also included the expression of hopes, plans, or expectations about the future.

Indications of whether a statement is future-oriented are, among others,

- explicit references
 - to a specific date or year (e.g., March 2025) or
 - a general reference to the future (e.g., “as we look to the future”);
- the grammar of the sentence in question, specifically the use of

- the simple future tense (e.g., “we will begin to work on”);
- the future continuous (e.g., “we will be beginning to work on”);
- the future perfect (e.g., “we will have begun to work on”);
- the future perfect continuous (e.g., “we will have been beginning to work on”);
- grammatical constructions with “going to” (e.g., “we are going to begin working on”);
- use of the subjunctive to refer to future events (e.g., “we hoped that we would be able to work on”).

Such statements also referred to decisions taken in the present and yielding gains in the future (“we continue to pursue this strategy, which will lead to x outcome”).

Example 13: “As we look to the future, the IMF needs to become even more responsive and effective in addressing the new challenges facing our membership” (IMF, 2010: 5).

2. PURPOSES OF GOVERNANCE

2.1. PURP_GENE Purposes of governance, general

Definition: Statements indicating one or several of the following aspects:

- the overarching purpose of the GGI (i.e., the objectives it tries to achieve and the underlying motivation/reason for its actions);
- the overarching mission of the GGI (i.e., the main task or set of tasks it seeks to complete);
- the vision the GGI has for its own future (i.e., its perception of what its own future will ideally look like);
- the main problem the GGI seeks to solve; and/or
- the mandate of the GGI (i.e., the basis on which it sees itself as having been authorised to act).

Each of these statements had to specifically refer to the GGI itself and needed to specify the content of such a mission/mandate, etc. (as opposed to statements such as “the GGI will continue to pursue its mission”). With regard to sentences describing the GGI’s vision, such statements needed to equally refer to the GGI itself, either by outlining what the GGI envisions itself to be like in the future, or how it expects that it itself will work towards its envisioned future improvement of world politics.

Statements falling under the PURP_GENE code needed to refer to the overarching purpose/mission, mandate, and/or main problem of the GGI as such, instead of to specific policies or decisions.

Coded statements commonly included keywords such as “mission” or “mandate” or “purpose” or “function”, even though a decision could also be made based on an interpretation of the overall meaning of the statement.

Example 14: “The World Bank is a development institution whose mission is to fight poverty and improve living standards for people in the developing world” (WB, 2000: n. pag.).

Example 15: “New World, New World Bank defines our vision for an institution that serves the emerging multipolar global economy” (WB, 2010: 1).

References

- FSC (2010) *Forest Stewardship Council: Synergies. Annual Report 2010* (Bonn: FSC International Center).
- IMF (2010) *Annual Report 2010. Supporting a Balanced Economic Recovery* (Washington D.C.: IMF).
- Scholte, Jan Aart, and Jonas Tallberg. 2018. Theorizing the Institutional Sources of Global Governance Legitimacy. In *Legitimacy in Global Governance: Sources, Processes, and Consequences*, edited by Jonas Tallberg, Karin Bäckstrand, and Jan Aart Scholte, pp. 56-74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- WB (2010) *The World Bank Annual Report 2010. Year in Review* (Washington D.C.: The World Bank).

Dr Catia Gregoratti, Lund University
Dr Nora Stappert, University of Leeds